

IMAC-QA Subcommittee
March 24, 2003
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Jackie Bennett, Racine Co., Co-chair, John Haine, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Co-chair, Marilyn Rudd, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Chris Elms, Dane Co., Kathy Judd, Dane Co., Joanne Ator, Door Co., Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co., Lisa Hanson, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE, Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/Southern Region, and Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co.

Members: Joanne Simpson, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Bernadette Connolly, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA,

1. Minutes from 2/24 meeting

Suggestions made by Jackie and Bernadette were incorporated.

2. Food stamp Powerpoint presentation

Jackie forwarded the presentation to Susan Wood, and the group discussed next steps. The committee developed this presentation as a tool to ensure that customers received a consistent message about their rights and responsibilities. Jackie found one item that needs to be updated, but otherwise believes it's ready to go.

However, there are a number of significant changes coming up in the FS program. How will the document be kept current? How will it be accessed? Jacaie said some workers are unable to access the web and CARES at the same time, so the group discussed the option of having it also available on a disc. We need a means to ensure version control, so if it's always accessed via the web, workers will always have the most current version.

The group also discussed options to introduce this tool to local agencies. An Ops Memo was suggested because local agencies see this communication method as more "official" than a DXBM or message sent through CARES and policy coordinators. It was also recommended that a demo occur at regional meetings.

Lisa agreed to work with Amy Mendel-Clemens and the communications staff to get the presentation approved for the website, explore ADA and translation issues (e.g. voice-over), establish a method to keep it current and write an Ops Memo to announce it.

3. Performance standard-Food Stamp payment accuracy \$24 million

FNS has established two measures: 7 states with the lowest error rates and 3 states with the most improved error rate will receive bonuses. It is unlikely that WI would be one of the seven states with the lowest error rate, but we definitely have a chance at “most improved”.

The group began to analyze the passthrough process for bonus or sanction. It is important to keep in mind that the language needs to clearly reflect that if the State does not receive a bonus, local agencies won't either. Likewise, if the state isn't required to pay a sanction, nor will local agencies. If Wisconsin is sanctioned in 2004, but receives a bonus as a result of another performance measure, we should allow local agencies to offset any sanction with other bonus funds.

In addition to potential for bonus money, other ways to increase payment accuracy were suggested. For example, regularly provide information about error rates for each local agency to induce “peer pressure”. Recognition of good performance is also an effective motivator.

Bonus passthrough

Issues

- What percentage of the bonus would be distributed to local agencies?
- Are all agencies eligible, or only those agencies from which at least one case is selected for the QC sample, or only those agencies with a valid (30 or more cases) sample?
- The group discussed whether there is a need for additional data (e.g. PAC, Second party reviews) in order to have another measure of local agency performance. If sufficient data were available, we could consider modeling the pass-through after the federal measure and divide bonus funds among the seven agencies with the lowest error rate and the three agencies with the most improved error rate.

Possible methods for calculating an agency's share of the bonus:

- Caseload size
- Issuance amounts
- Agency size range (small, medium, large, Milwaukee)
- Proportion of QC sample- flat amount per correct case
- Percentage of IM allocation

Penalty passthrough process

Issues:

- Currently Agency Preventable Error (APE) penalties are assessed only to agencies with at least 30 cases in the QC sample. If all agencies (or all agencies from which at least one case is selected for the QC sample) are eligible for bonus funds, should they also be liable if we are sanctioned? The group feels that the method should be consistent between the bonus and penalty passthrough processes. The group plans to re-evaluate

the penalty pass-through process and will likely recommend that the 30-case minimum be eliminated.

- A suggestion was made to allow agencies to develop a corrective action/reinvestment plan to offset sanctions that would mirror the state/federal process.
- Should a penalty be imposed for only agency-preventable errors, or for all of the errors since all of them contribute to the error rate that resulted in a sanction? The group consensus was to assess a penalty only for agency-preventable errors.

Possible methods for calculating the sanction amount:

- Caseload size
- Issuance amounts
- Agency size range (small, medium, large and Milwaukee)
- Percentage of the IM allocation
- Proportion of the QC sample- flat amount per error case
- Vary the amount of pass-through operator

John will send out an e-mail that describes the options. Committee members are asked to respond and express their preferences.

Next Meeting: April 14th from 9a-3p at the Dane County Job Center